

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 13-15, 17-22, and 24-44 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action mailed February 8, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-4, 13-14, 19, 22, 24-29, 31-34, 36, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Iwanczyk et al. (USP 5,773,829 – hereinafter Iwanczyk). The Examiner next rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 13-14, 19, 22, 24-25, 34-38, and 40-41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being Tsunota et al. (USP 6,495,845 – hereinafter Tsunota). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsunota et al. Claims 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh et al. (USP 6,061,419) in view of Tsunota et al. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwanczyk et al. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsunota et al.

Paragraph [0034] of the Specification has been amended to delete the word “produce” and substitute “prevent” therefor. No new matter has been added. As stated in paragraph [0036] of the Specification, the reflector layers are generally opaque and are designed to prevent light emissions from each of the scintillators.

Before addressing the Examiner’s comments, Applicant points out that in the Office Action of August 4, 2005, the Examiner indicated that claim 30 was objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In the Office Action mailed Feb. 8, 2006, the Examiner indicated that claim 30 was rejected. However, the Examiner has not presented any prior art against the subject matter of claim 30 or any indication why the allowability of claim 30 has been removed. Additionally, the Examiner has not presented any prior art against the subject matter of claims 42-44. As such, claims 30 and 42-44 are believed to be patentably distinct over the art of record.

With regard to claim 1, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Iwanczyk and under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Tsunota. Applicant has amended claim 1 to define over the prior art. Amended claim 1 calls for a reflective layer coated to a top face of the scintillator array. The Examiner stated that Iwanczyk teaches “a reflective layer coated to a face of the scintillator array (figure 2).” *Office Action, Feb. 8, 2006, pp. 2-3.* Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Iwanczyk teaches that “[e]ach scintillator segment (e.g., 36A) is surrounded on its sides and its top by an optical reflector 60 that is spaced from the segment by an air gap 62.” *Col. 8, lines 41-43 (emphasis added)*. As such, since Iwanczyk teaches an air gap that separates the optical reflector from the scintillator segment, Iwanczyk fails to teach or suggest a reflective layer coated to a top face of the scintillator array.

The Examiner stated that Tsunota teaches “a reflective layer coated to a face of the scintillator array (figure 1).” *Office Action, Feb. 8, 2006, p. 3*. However, Tsunota fails to teach or suggest a reflective layer coated to a top face of the scintillator array as called for in claim 1. Tsunota fails to teach or suggest any reflective layer above or over a top face of the scintillator array.

Accordingly, that which is called for in claim 1 is not shown, disclosed, taught, or suggested in the art of record. As such, Applicant believes claim 1, and the claims which depend therefrom, are patentably distinct over the art of record.

The Examiner rejected claims 22, 34, 36, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Iwanczyk. The Examiner also rejected claims 22, 34, 36, 37, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Tsunota. Claims 22, 34, 36, 37, and 41 have been amended to define over the prior art. Claim 22 has been amended to include the step of disposing a reflective layer directly on an x-ray receptor surface of the scintillator array. Claims 34, 36, 37, and 41 have been amended to call for a reflective top coat cast on an x-ray receptor surface of each of the plurality of scintillators.

As stated above with regard to claim 1, Iwanczyk teaches an air gap that separates the optical reflector from the scintillator segment. Also as stated above, Tsunota fails to teach or suggest any reflective layer above or over a top face of the scintillator array. As such, neither Iwanczyk nor Tsunota teaches or suggests disposing a reflective layer directly on an x-ray receptor surface of the scintillator array or a reflective top coat cast on an x-ray receptor surface of each of the plurality of scintillators as called for in amended claims 22, 34, 36, 37, and 41.

Accordingly, that which is called for in claims 22, 34, 36, 37, and 41 is not shown, disclosed, taught, or suggested in the art of record. As such, Applicant believes

claims 22, 34, 36, 37, and 41, and the claims which depend therefrom, are patentably distinct over the art of record.

Therefore, in light of at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance for claims 1, 3, 4, 13-15, 17-22, and 24-44.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of these Amendments and Remarks and cordially invites the Examiner to call the undersigned, should the Examiner consider any matters unresolved.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent L. Baker/

Kent L. Baker
Registration No. 52,584
Phone 262-376-5170 ext. 15
klb@zpspatents.com

Dated: May 8, 2006
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.200

P.O. ADDRESS:

Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC
14135 North Cedarburg Road
Mequon, WI 53097-1416
262-376-5170